

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on April 18, 2005, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1-8, 10-24, and 26-33 are amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-33 are now pending in this application.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-8, 10-24, and 26-33 do not introduce any new subject matter and are intended to cover additional claimable subject matter fully supported by the originally filed specification.

Examiner Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for conducting an interview by phone on May 31, 2005. During this interview various claims were discussed in view of the cited references and the claim objections.

Specification

The title of the invention was indicated to be not descriptive.

Applicant has amended the title and believes that the title is sufficiently descriptive.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 8 and 10 were objected to as being grammatically awkward.

The Applicant has amended these claims in accordance with suggestions discussed in conversation with the Examiner and believes that these claims are presently in condition for allowance.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-7, 9-16 and 18-33 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Deter, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,428,169).

The Deter reference appears to describe two light sources, a projector for providing a laser light (Col. 6, lines 36-46) and the sun for providing ambient sun light (Col. 7, lines 55-61; Fig. 2). The Deter reference does not describe an ambient light source which outputs wavelengths in a first group and a second group, wherein

the intensity of wavelengths in the second group is greater than that of wavelengths in the first group.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claim 1, as amended, recites:

an ambient light source that is configured to output visible wavelengths of light in the second group that has a greater intensity than that of wavelengths of light output by the ambient light source in the first group

Applicant's independent claim 10, as amended, recites:

wavelengths in the second group have a greater intensity than wavelengths in the first group; and a light filtering structure that: reflects and absorbs wavelengths of light emitted by an ambient light emitting device in the first group; and transmits wavelengths of light emitted by the ambient light emitting device in the second group

Furthermore, Applicant's independent claim 16, as amended, recites:

the wavelengths of light transmitted by the light filtering structure in the second group have a greater intensity than that of the wavelengths of light transmitted by a ambient light source in the first group

Moreover, Applicant's independent claim 22, as amended, recites:

outputting by an ambient light source: wavelengths of light in the first group; and wavelengths of light in a second group not included in the first group, wherein the wavelengths of light output by the ambient light source in the second group have a greater intensity than that of the wavelengths of light output by the ambient light source in the first group

Applicant's independent claim 28, as amended, recites:

configuring an ambient light source to output: wavelengths of light in one or more ranges in a first group [and] . . . wavelengths of light in a second group not included in the first group, wherein: . . . wavelengths of light output in the second group have a greater intensity than wavelengths of light output in the first group.

In addition, Applicant's independent claim 33, as amended, recites

means for providing ambient light that outputs visible wavelengths of light in the second group that have a greater intensity than that of wavelengths of light output by the providing means in the first group

As such, each and every element and limitation of independent claims 1, 10, 16, 22, 28, and 33, as amended, are not described by the Deter reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 102 rejection of independent claims 1, 10, 16, 22, 28 and 33, as well as all claims that depend therefrom.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 8 and 17 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Deter, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,428,169) in view of Lippey, et al. (U.S. Patent 6,847,483).

Claim 8 depends directly from independent claim 1 and claim 17 depends directly from independent claim 16. For the reasons provided above, the Applicant believes that independent claims 1 and 16, as amended, are allowable over the Deter reference. The Lippey reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Deter reference. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103 rejection of dependent claims 8 and 17.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney Gregg W. Wisdom at (360) 212-8052 to facilitate prosecution of this matter.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR §1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS AMENDMENT Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 23rd day of June, 2005.

Shannon L. Day
Name

[Signature]
Signature

Respectfully Submitted,
James R. Przybyla, et al.

By their Representatives,
BROOKS & CAMERON, PLLC
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 500
Minneapolis, MN 55403

By: [Signature]
Edward J. Brooks III
Reg. No. 40,925

Date: 6/23/2005